

SUMMARY OF THE SEIS

INTRODUCTION

The National Park Service (NPS) has been dealing with winter use issues for several decades. More recently, these issues have resulted in intensive study and public involvement. In 1990 a Winter Use Plan was completed for Yellowstone National Park (YNP), Grand Teton National Park (GTNP), and the John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway (the Parkway). In 1994 the Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee (GYCC — the National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service) began work on an interagency assessment of winter use issues culminating in the 1999 final report, *Winter Visitor Use Management: a Multi-agency Assessment*. In 1997, the Fund for Animals filed suit against the NPS, the settlement of which required NPS to produce an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and make a new decision on winter use. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) was published, and a Record of Decision (ROD) was subsequently signed on November 22, 2000. The decision eliminated recreational snowmobile and snowplane use from the parks by the winter of 2003-2004.

On December 6, 2000, a lawsuit brought by the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association and others asked for the decision to be set aside on the basis of alleged National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process infractions. The Department of the Interior negotiated a procedural settlement, which became final on June 29, 2001. As provided in that settlement agreement, NPS is acting as lead agency to prepare this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and the State of Wyoming is acting as a cooperating agency. Subsequent to the settlement, all other agencies that signed cooperating agency agreements during the earlier EIS process agreed to be cooperating agencies for the SEIS. These agencies are: the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), the States of Montana and Idaho, Fremont County in Idaho, Gallatin and Park Counties in Montana, and Park and Teton Counties in Wyoming. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has become a new cooperating agency in this effort.

THE PURPOSE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL EIS

The purpose for preparing this SEIS is to further the purposes of NEPA by soliciting more public comment on the earlier decision and alternatives to it. Additional information from the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association will be considered, as well as any other relevant new or updated information not available at the time of the earlier decision. The fundamental purpose and need for action in the supplemental analysis remains the same as in the Final EIS, and the Final EIS is liberally referenced in the SEIS, rather than repeating much of the same information. The SEIS focuses on four alternatives to the existing decision, seeking a means of allowing snowmobiles into the parks or deferring implementation of the existing decision.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MANDATES

In the context of this SEIS, a body of public laws, Executive Orders (EOs), regulations, and directives of the Secretary of the Interior and the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks represent objectives to be achieved in winter use management. Chief among the laws are the NPS Organic Act, The General Authorities Act, the Yellowstone National Park Act, the Grand Teton National Park Act, and the John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway Act, The Clean Air Act, and the Endangered Species Act. EOs that provide additional context and direction are EO 11644, Use of Off-Road Vehicles on the Public Lands, and the EO that amends it, EO 11989. By NPS regulation (36 CFR

2.18), snowmobiling is generally prohibited except on designated routes and water surfaces available for motorized use at other times and “only when their use is consistent with the park’s natural, cultural, scenic and aesthetic values, safety considerations, park management objectives, and will not disturb wildlife or damage park resources.”

Current policy guidance for NPS is published in *Management Policies 2001*. The policies are consistent with laws, regulations and EOs. Policies most applicable to this SEIS and the existing decision are listed here.

- 1.4.3 The NPS Obligation to Conserve and Provide for Enjoyment of Park Resources and Values
- 1.4.4 The Prohibition on Impairment of Park Resources and Values
- 1.4.5 What Constitutes Impairment of Park Resources and Values
- 1.4.6 What Constitutes Park Resources and Values
- 1.4.7 Decision-making Requirements to Avoid Impairments
- 4.7.1 Air Quality
- 4.9 Soundscape Management
- 8.2 Visitor Use
- 8.2.3 Use of Motorized Equipment
- 8.2.3.1 Off-road Vehicle Use
- 8.2.3.2 Snowmobiles

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The purpose and need for action as the basis for this SEIS, in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR 1502.13), is the same as that for the previous Final EIS. The fundamental purpose and need for action is framed by a set of desired conditions, compared to existing conditions. The desired conditions are distilled from the large body of laws, regulations, EOs, and policies that are summarized above. Desired conditions or objectives for winter use management are:

- Visitors have a range of appropriate winter recreation opportunities from primitive to developed. Winter recreation complements the unique characteristics of each landscape within the ecosystem.
- Recreational experiences are offered in an appropriate setting; they do not take place where they will irreparably impact air quality, wildlife, cultural areas, the experiences of other park visitors, or other park values and resources.
- High quality facilities are provided in parks to support the need for safety and enhanced visitor experiences.
- Conflicts among user groups are minimal.
- Visitors know how to participate safely in winter use activities without damaging resources.
- Oversnow vehicle sound and emission levels are reduced to protect employee and public health and safety, enhance visitor experience, and protect natural resources.

Existing conditions, supported by information in the Final EIS are:

- **Visitor Access:** Access to most locations is limited to those who can afford to ride a snowcoach or snowmobile. Access for personal motorized use via snowmobile has increased greatly since the beginnings of the winter program in the three parks. Snowmobile use, in current numbers, is in conflict with use of parks’ facilities by other user groups.

- **Visitor Experience:** A variety of winter use conflicts have been identified involving the relationship between users and among different user groups, which affects how people experience the parks. At destination facilities and trails open to both motorized and nonmotorized users, nonmotorized users express dissatisfaction with the sound, odor, and quantity of snowmobiles. These vehicles affect the solitude, quiet, and clean air and other resource values that many people expect and wish to enjoy in National Parks.
- **Visitor Safety:** The current level of snowmobile accidents, unsafe users, inherent winter risks, and conflicts between users are of concern from the standpoint of public safety.
- **Resources:** Parks have documented health hazards from snowmachine emissions, harassment and unintended impacts on wildlife from groomed trails and their use, degradation of air quality-related values, and impacts on the natural soundscape. Many people strongly object to the degradation of inherent parks' values, as well as how these impacts affect people and their recreational opportunities.

SCOPE OF ANALYSIS — RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The scope of analysis determines the range of alternatives to be considered. Pages 7-8 in the Final EIS describe the scope of analysis resulting in the seven alternatives evaluated in that document. The analysis in this SEIS is limited to two alternatives that implement the existing decision, and three alternatives that would allow snowmobile recreation to continue in the parks on the basis of improved snowmobile technology and/or other measures that address the adverse impacts of snowmobile use. In accordance with the settlement agreement, the SEIS specifically evaluates improvements in snowmobile technology to address air resource issues and soundscape issues. The scope of the analysis incorporates the need to eliminate or successfully mitigate impacts of snowmobile use, in addition to emissions and noise, on wildlife and visitor experience. The scope of analysis does not include portions of the earlier decision regarding nonmotorized winter use. Since the driving force consists of information on new snowmobile technology, there is no reason to re-evaluate nonmotorized use decisions. In similar fashion, a number of features incorporated into the earlier decision do not require re-analysis because they would apply consistently to all alternatives in the SEIS, and because they are supported by environmental analysis in the Final EIS.

DECISION TO BE MADE

The “no action” alternative in this SEIS is represented by the decision currently in place and documented by a ROD published in November of 2000. The settlement agreement represents direction to engage in a process to reconsider this decision based on information about new snowmobile technology. Therefore, the decision to be made – based on consideration of information and alternatives in both the Final EIS and the SEIS – is whether to affirm the previous decision or to make a new one. The nature of the decision to be made remains essentially the same as described in the Final EIS, to determine which alternative best meets the purpose and need for action summarized above. In light of the need to prepare an SEIS, resulting from a lengthy settlement negotiation process, the schedule for implementing the earlier decision has been delayed. Therefore, the SEIS also considers an alternative to the existing decision, which allows more time for implementing the program put forward in that decision. So, part of the decision to be made is whether or not to delay implementing the earlier decision, if that decision is affirmed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The *Federal Register* Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an SEIS invited public comments on the earlier decision and alternatives to it, as well as any new information. Comments made in response to the NOI supplement the many comments received during the earlier EIS process. Nearly 360,000

comment letters were received on the Draft SEIS, some 97% of which were form letters. Approximately 80% of these commenters favored the existing decision to eliminate snowmobiles from the parks.

MAJOR ISSUES

The Final EIS describes five major issues that relate to the purpose and need for action for the future of winter use in the three park units. The purpose of developing alternatives is to look at and compare different means for resolving these issues. These issue topics were important for evaluating and disclosing impacts in the Final EIS, and they remain the focus for the SEIS. The issues were addressed by the decision that selected Final EIS alternative G, and they have been resolved to the greatest possible degree on that basis. A detailed explanation of how these issues were resolved may be found in the ROD. These issues occur to a greater or lesser degree in various zones of the parks.

Social and Economic Issues. Local businesses provide services to visitors near both parks, and many local economies rely, in part, on revenues from the parks' visitors in the winter. Concern was voiced in response to the Draft EIS that eliminating oversnow travel and snowmobiles in particular or closing an entrance to a park during the winter could have a detrimental effect on local economies. More recent concerns have been voiced that growth in snowmobile use in the parks should be allowed. Other commenters stated that concern for the parks' resources should be elevated above economics.

Human Health and Safety. Four primary health and safety issues were identified regarding winter visitor use. Motorized vehicular emissions and noise affect employee and visitor health. Operating speeds and the frequency of motor vehicle accidents and fatalities, as well as the number of nighttime collisions involving wildlife, are of concern. Avalanche hazards exist in some areas. There are safety problems where different modes of winter transport are co-located or are in close proximity.

Natural Resources. Impacts of winter use on natural resources revolve around three major issues: the impact of groomed surfaces and their use on wildlife; the impact of snowmobile emissions on air quality and air quality-related values; and the impact of noise from snowmobiles and snowcoaches on the natural soundscape. Many people articulate these concerns, but some others deny that there are any significant impacts on natural resources.

Visitor Use and Access. Different recreation user groups contend that the national parks offer either too much or not enough of various types of use. Many people contend that motorized use has greatly affected opportunities for nonmotorized use in the Greater Yellowstone Area (GYA). People who advocate for snowmobile use, including service and equipment providers in gateway communities, indicate that there is a right to personal (individual) access to the parks for this use, and that limiting the use would affect business.

Visitor Experience. Expectations for quality winter recreation experiences are different for different user groups and there are differences within user groups. This raises contention between groups for which quiet and solitude and clean air needs conflict with the impacts of snowmobiles, especially when facilities for these different groups are in close proximity to each other. At issue is the nature of visitor enjoyment and its relationship to park resources and values.

ALTERNATIVES

Five alternatives for winter visitor use in the three park units are evaluated in the SEIS. Three of the alternatives (alternatives 2, 3, and 4) are limited specifically to actions that allow snowmobile recreation to continue in the parks. Alternative 1a was the selected alternative in the *Record of Decision for the Winter Use Plans and Final Environmental Impact Statement for Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and the John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway* (ROD) as modified by the final rule published in the *Federal Register* on January 22, 2001. This alternative serves as the

no action alternative. Alternative 1b is the same as alternative 1a, but it defers implementation for one more year. The remaining alternatives for the SEIS were formulated in response to the concern that information on new snowmobile technologies and other connected issues was not included in the original Final EIS. Consequently, alternatives 2, 3, and 4 were formulated specifically to provide an additional basis for the choice of snowmobiles as a mode of winter transportation in the parks. Alternative 4, the preferred alternative, was not included in the Draft SEIS, but has been included and analyzed in the Final SEIS. Alternative 1b has been identified as the environmentally preferred alternative. Table S-1 summarizes the features of all alternatives in the SEIS.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Given the scope of the SEIS, much of the affected environment has already been described in the Final EIS. Therefore, large portions of the Final EIS affected environment are incorporated by reference in the SEIS. The emphasis for analysis is on those topics for which there is new information, with enough other discussion for convenience of the reader and for continuity in explaining the effects analysis. Impact topics that are the focus of additional analysis discussed in the SEIS are shown below.

| Topic | Focus of Additional Analysis |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Socioeconomics | New economic information has been provided by the State of Wyoming. Some alternative provisions may allow a more refined analysis compared to the Final EIS. |
| Air Quality and Public Health | Industry and independent information about “cleaner and quieter” snowmobiles, and additional information about snowcoach emissions and sound, may alter analysis of effects. A visibility analysis and Prevention of Significant Deterioration analysis have been completed. In addition, there is additional focus on toxic air pollutants. Effects of interim limits on snowmobile use vary by alternative on this topic. |
| Public Safety | Effects of interim limits on snowmobile use vary by alternative on this topic. |
| Wildlife - Bison and Elk | Some alternative provisions may allow a more refined analysis compared to the Final EIS, showing differences between alternatives. |
| Natural Soundscapes | Industry and independent information about “quieter” snowmobiles, and additional information about snowcoach sound, may alter analysis of effects. Also, effects of interim limits on snowmobile use will vary by alternative in regard to this topic. |
| Visitor Access and Circulation | Effects of interim limits on snowmobile use vary by alternative on this topic. |
| Visitor Experience | Industry and independent information about “cleaner and quieter” snowmobiles, and additional information about snowcoach emissions and sound, may alter analysis of effects. Effects of interim limits on snowmobile use vary by alternative on this topic. |
| Adjacent Lands | Industry and independent information about available “cleaner and quieter” snowmobiles may alter analysis of effects. Also, effects of interim limits on snowmobile use will vary by alternative in regard to this topic. |

EFFECTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives are intended to sharply define the issues and provide a clear basis of choice. Since this is a Supplemental EIS (SEIS), the alternatives in this document focus the issues sharply on whether snowmobiles should be allowed in the three park units and, if they are allowed, under what circumstances. The existing condition in regard to impact topics addressed in the SEIS is presented in Chapter III. The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects in regard to these topics are disclosed in Chapter IV. For each impact topic the methods and assumptions used in its analyses are presented,

followed by the direct and indirect effects for each alternative. At the end of the chapter, cumulative effects are analyzed for each alternative, as are impacts on adjacent lands. Table S-2 quantifies, where possible, and summarizes the impacts of the alternatives in a comparative form. The existing condition for each topic also is presented for comparison under the title of Final EIS alternative A. Relative alternative impacts by topic are briefly presented below.

Socioeconomics

Ranking economic impacts, alternatives 1a and 1b would have the greatest impact of those evaluated in the SEIS compared to the existing economic outputs in the 3-state region, the 5-county area, and on West Yellowstone, Montana. None of the SEIS alternatives would have measurable impacts on the other GYA gateway communities. This analysis indicates that these impacts are short term. Compared to current output levels for each of the economic analysis areas, all of the SEIS alternatives produce less than a 1% decline in both jobs and dollars.

Air Quality

Compared to the existing condition in which unregulated snowmobile use is occurring, alternatives 1a and 1b would improve air quality in the parks more than the other alternatives. Alternative 2 would improve conditions the least. Under alternative 2, there would continue to be air quality impacts along travel corridors and at staging areas, especially related to carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM₁₀), hydrocarbons (HC), and toxic air pollutants. In addition, alternative 2 would lead to visibility impacts at four locations. The preferred alternative would impact visibility at only one location. Because of this, alternative 2 would lead to impairment of park resources and values related to air quality in both YNP and the Parkway. Alternatives 3 and 4 include sufficient mitigation to significantly improve the existing air quality condition, and would not impair park resources or values. None of the alternatives proposed in the SEIS would be likely to exceed the maximum Montana, Wyoming, or National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for CO or PM₁₀.

Public and Employee Health and Safety

For both employees and visitors, alternatives 1a and 1b would achieve the greatest improvement relative to the existing condition. The indices to this determination are numbers and types of vehicles and levels of NAAQS pollutant criteria emissions. The former is related to accident frequencies and conflicts. The latter is related to physical health parameters impacted by pollutants, particularly for those who are susceptible to respiratory difficulties. With the fewest numbers and types of vehicles operating at speeds and on schedules that minimize risk of incident, alternatives 1a and 1b would have the least impact. These alternatives also produce the lowest emission levels, including toxic air pollutants. In both respects alternative 2 would have the greatest impact.

Wildlife – Elk and Bison

All alternatives would maintain the same amount of groomed motorized routes in important ungulate habitat within the parks. Therefore, effects associated with groomed routes — their potential influence on wildlife movements and distribution — would be the same for each alternative. Effects associated with the use of groomed routes, including collisions, habitat displacement and behavioral changes, are directly related to the numbers and patterns of oversnow vehicle use. Alternatives 1a and 1b feature oversnow motorized travel by mass transit snowcoach only, thus reducing traffic volumes, lowering average travel speed, and facilitating travel operations in a scheduled and controlled fashion. Therefore the effects of these alternatives on elk and bison would be the lowest. Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 feature snowmobiles and snowcoaches, therefore effects would be greater than alternatives 1a and 1b. However, because alternatives 3 and 4 require the use of an NPS permitted guide, overall effects would be less than alternative 2. Impacts resulting from alternative 2 could be of a sufficient magnitude to constitute impairment of park resources and values in YNP.

Natural Soundscapes

Compared to the existing condition in which unregulated snowmobile use is occurring, alternatives 1a and 1b would improve the condition of the natural soundscape significantly. Overall noise levels and areas in which motorized recreation vehicles are audible would be greatly reduced because of the substantial reduction in the total number of vehicles. The impacts of all the alternatives depend on the atmospheric and snow conditions, and on whether background noise (such as wind) is average or quiet. Because of requirements for quieter snowmobiles, and limits on the number of snowmobiles, none of the alternatives proposed in this SEIS would impair the natural soundscape.

Visitor Access and Circulation

All alternatives are intended to retain motorized oversnow access to accommodate average annual levels of visitation to the three park units. In respect to the amount of access, and locations whereby access is obtained, there is no significant difference among the alternatives. The chief differences among the alternatives are the mode of access and the allowable limits by entrance. These differences relate more to visitor experience than access.

Visitor Experience

Visitor experience is a function of many parameters. Comparisons of visitor experience must be made in the context of the existing condition, in which relatively unregulated snowmobile use occurs. In this situation, impacts are occurring to the natural soundscape, the viewing of wildlife, clean air, and other experiential factors. Under existing conditions, effects on visitors who prefer an essentially nonmotorized experience are evident. This is a significant part of the purpose and need for action, which crosses into all other impact topics. Relative to the existing condition, alternatives 1a and 1b remedy impacts on these visitors the most. These alternatives represent an incentive to visit for potential visitors who have been displaced in the past or who do not visit because of the existing condition. Relative to the existing condition and these visitors, alternatives 2, 3, and 4 improve conditions to the extent that snowmobiles are cleaner, quieter, and fewer in number.

From the standpoint of those who enjoy snowmobiling, and through personal preference would not enjoy access by snowcoach, alternatives 1a and 1b would significantly impact their experience. They could still enjoy park resources and values, but their enjoyment is based fundamentally on access by snowmobile. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 preserve this mode of access. The limitation offered by alternative 2 to improve existing conditions relative to visitor experience is that, over time, snowmobiles coming into the park would need to be cleaner and quieter. Alternatives 3 and 4 strike a greater balance initially between motorized and nonmotorized use, relative to desired experiences, by also requiring the cleanest and quietest snowmobiles available, and by controlling their use through NPS permitted guides. All alternatives contain adaptive management provisions intended to adjust management in accordance with resource and visitor experience needs.

Table S-1. Summary of alternative actions Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and the John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway winter use plan.

| ALTERNATIVES 1a and 1b | | ALTERNATIVE 2 |
|---|---|---|
| Emissions Requirements | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Snowcoach travel only managed by concessions permit and required to meet the best available environmental standards, (currently the Mattrack snowcoach). ▪ Phase in these requirements through the permitting process. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rental snowmobiles: 200 g/kW-hr (149g/hp-hr) for CO and 75 g/kW -hr (56g/hp-hr) for HC (EPA emission rule for snowmobiles) beginning in 2003-2004. ▪ Public snowmobiles: allow any 4-stroke and any 2-stroke using bio-fuels and lubes. ▪ By 2006-2007 all snowmobiles must meet 2012 EPA standards. ▪ Snowcoaches: For the first five years, allow snowcoaches irrespective of emissions. After five years, only “new concept snowcoaches” will be allowed. |
| Sound Requirements | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Snowcoaches: 75 dB phasing to 70 dB(A).[†] | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rental snowmobiles: 75 dB(A).[‡] ▪ Public snowmobiles: 78 dB(A).[‡] ▪ Snowcoaches: For the first five years, 78 dB(A), after five years, 75 dB(A).[†] |
| Interim Limits and Phase In Period | | |
| <p>Alternative 1a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2003-2004 close Jackson Lake and Teton Park Road to motorized vehicles. ▪ 2003-2004 snowmobiles at a maximum of 50% of current average day at West and South Entrances; current use maintained at all other areas. ▪ 2004-2005 snowcoach only travel, snowmobile access maintained to inholdings and USFS areas in GTNP. | <p>Alternative 1b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2003-2004 close Jackson Lake and Teton Park Road to motorized vehicles. ▪ 2004-2005 snowmobiles at a maximum of 50% of current average day at West and South Entrances; current use maintained at all other areas. ▪ 2005-2006 snowcoach only travel, snowmobile access maintained to inholdings and USFS areas in GTNP. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interim limit for monitoring and adaptive management program. As monitoring and carrying capacity studies indicate, use numbers may be adjusted. ▪ North Entrance limited to 25 snowmobiles per day. ▪ West Entrance limited to 825 snowmobiles in year 1. ▪ West Entrance limited to 725 snowmobiles in year 2. ▪ West Entrance limited to 600 in year 3. (Note: West Entrance limits in years 2 and 3 would only be effective if a commensurate number of seats on “new concept snowcoaches” become available each year at West Yellowstone to replace the visitors lost by the decrease in snowmobiles.) ▪ East Entrance limited to 100 snowmobiles per day. ▪ South Entrance limited to 225 snowmobiles per day. ▪ CDST 75 snowmobiles per day. ▪ Grassy Lake Road no snowmobile limit. ▪ Snowcoach travel no limit. |

[†]Snowcoach sound measured at 50 ft on the A-weighted scale at full throttle.

[‡]Snowmobile sound measured at 50 ft on the A-weighted scale at 40 mph.

| ALTERNATIVES 1a and 1b | ALTERNATIVE 2 |
|--|--|
| Access | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All oversnow routes open to snowcoaches. ▪ Snowmachine access eliminated on the Teton Park Road and on the frozen surface of Jackson Lake. ▪ Levels of snowcoach access would be unrestricted. ▪ In 2010, the road from Colter Bay to Flagg Ranch becomes an oversnow route. ▪ Increase both the size and number of warming huts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All oversnow routes open except snowmachine access eliminated on the Teton Park Road and fishermen only the frozen surface of Jackson Lake. ▪ Levels of access are restricted to the average peak day numbers for the West Entrance and higher than peak day average for East, South and North Entrances. ▪ Snowcoach numbers unrestricted. ▪ Increase groomed nonmotorized trails. ▪ Increase both the size and number of warming huts. |
| Wildlife | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nonmotorized uses in wildlife winter ranges and thermal areas limited to travel on designated routes or trails. ▪ Construct wildlife-proof garbage facilities. ▪ Manage adaptively-continue scientific studies and monitoring regarding winter visitor use and park resources. Close selected areas of the parks if scientific studies indicate that human presence or activities have a detrimental effect that could otherwise not be mitigated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nonmotorized uses in wildlife winter ranges and thermal areas limited to travel on designated routes or trails. ▪ Construct wildlife-proof garbage facilities. ▪ Employ additional law enforcement. ▪ Manage adaptively. |
| Winter Season | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Late November to mid-March. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mid-November to mid-December access only by rubber track snowcoaches, snowshoes or skis. ▪ Mid-December to mid-March snowmobile and snowcoach travel. |
| Interpretation and Orientation | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information program on snow and trail conditions, points of interest and available recreation opportunities. ▪ Increase interpretive opportunities on the unique aspects of the winter environment. Provide interpretive programs at destination areas and at warming huts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information program on snow and trail conditions, points of interest and available recreation opportunities. ▪ Increase interpretive opportunities on the unique aspects of the winter environment. Provide interpretive programs at destination areas and at warming huts. ▪ Develop educational video on trail etiquette, snowmobile safety, and proper behavior around wildlife. |

| ALTERNATIVE 3 | ALTERNATIVE 4 |
|---|--|
| Emissions Requirements | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cleaner and quieter technologies managed by NPS permit and managed adaptively. ▪ Interim emission requirements are based on BAT and evaluated annually as emissions are reduced numbers could be increased. ▪ Snowmobile and snowcoach BAT is capable of reducing HC by 90% and CO emissions by 70% from EPA baseline snowmobile assumptions. Historic snowcoaches initially exempted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cleaner and quieter technologies managed by NPS permit and managed adaptively. ▪ Interim emission requirements are based on BAT and evaluated annually as emissions are reduced numbers could be increased. ▪ Snowmobile and snowcoach BAT is capable of reducing HC by 90% and CO emissions by 70% from EPA baseline snowmobile assumptions. Historic snowcoaches initially exempted. |
| Sound Requirements | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interim sound emission requirements are based on BAT and evaluated annually (as sound emissions are reduced numbers could be increased). ▪ Snowmobiles: Any snowmobile 73 dB(A) or less.[†] ▪ Snowcoaches: Initially, 75 dB(A) by 2008.[‡] Historic snowcoaches exempted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interim sound emission requirements are based on BAT and evaluated annually (as sound emissions are reduced numbers could be increased). ▪ Snowmobiles: Any snowmobile 73 dB(A) or less.[†] ▪ Snowcoaches: Initially, 75 dB(A) by 2008.[‡] Historic snowcoaches exempted. |
| Interim Limits and Phase In Period | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interim limits for monitoring and adaptive management program implemented in 2003-2004. As monitoring and carrying capacity studies indicate use numbers may be adjusted. ▪ North Entrance limited to 100 per day. ▪ West Entrance limited to 330 per day. ▪ East Entrance limited to 100 per day. ▪ South Entrance limited to 400 per day. ▪ CDST limited to 100 per day. ▪ Grassy Lake limited to 100 per day. ▪ Snowcoach travel no limit. ▪ Require BAT for all snowmobiles beginning in 2003-2004. ▪ Implement guided snowmobile requirements in 2003-2004. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interim limit for monitoring and adaptive management program during the first two years. As monitoring and carrying capacity studies indicate, use numbers may be adjusted. ▪ North Entrance limited to 50 snowmobiles per day. ▪ West Entrance limited to 550 snowmobiles per day. ▪ East Entrance limited to 100 snowmobiles per day. ▪ South Entrance limited to 250 snowmobiles per day. ▪ CDST limited to 75 snowmobiles per day. ▪ Grassy Lake Road limited to 75 snowmobiles per day. ▪ Snowcoach travel no limit. ▪ Require BAT for commercially guided snowmobiles in 2003-2004; all other snowmobiles must be BAT in 2004-2005. ▪ Implement 80:20 commercial:non-commercial guided requirements in 2003-2004. |

[†]Snowmobile sound measured at full acceleration using SAE J192 test procedures.

[‡]Snowcoach sound measured at 50 ft on the A-weighted scale at 25 mph.

| ALTERNATIVE 3 | ALTERNATIVE 4 |
|---|---|
| Access | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All major oversnow routes open except snowmachine access eliminated on the Teton Park Road and on the frozen surface of Jackson Lake. ▪ In 2009, the road from Colter Bay to Flagg Ranch becomes an oversnow route. ▪ Increase groomed nonmotorized trails. ▪ Increase both the size and number of warming huts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All major oversnow routes open except snowmachine access eliminated on the Teton Park Road and on the frozen surface of Jackson Lake. ▪ In 2009, the road from Colter Bay to Flagg Ranch becomes an oversnow route. ▪ Increase groomed nonmotorized trails. ▪ Increase both the size and number of warming huts. |
| Wildlife | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nonmotorized uses in wildlife winter ranges and thermal areas limited to travel on designated routes or trails. ▪ Construct wildlife-proof garbage facilities. ▪ Manage adaptively; action items include signing, employing additional enforcement rangers, limiting access. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nonmotorized uses in wildlife winter ranges and thermal areas limited to travel on designated routes or trails. ▪ Construct wildlife-proof garbage facilities. ▪ Employ additional law enforcement. ▪ Manage adaptively; action items include signing, employing additional enforcement rangers, limiting access. |
| Winter Season | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Late November to mid-March. ▪ Last week of February (after President's Day) to mid-March access by snowcoach, skis or snowshoes only. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Late November to mid-March. |
| Interpretation and Orientation | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information program on snow and trail conditions, points of interest and available recreation opportunities. ▪ Increase interpretive opportunities on the unique aspects of the winter environment. Provide interpretive programs at destination areas and at warming huts. ▪ Develop educational video on trail etiquette, snowmobile safety, and proper behavior around wildlife. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information program on snow and trail conditions, points of interest and available recreation opportunities. ▪ Increase interpretive opportunities on the unique aspects of the winter environment. Provide interpretive programs at destination areas and at warming huts. ▪ Develop educational video on trail etiquette, snowmobile safety, and proper behavior around wildlife. |

This page intentionally left blank.

Table S-2. Summary of effects between the existing condition and SEIS alternatives.

| | FEIS Alternative A (Existing Condition) | SEIS Alternatives 1a and 1b | SEIS Alternative 2 | SEIS Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 – The Preferred Alternative |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Socioeconomics | <p><u>Economic Indices:</u> Total economic output in MT, WY, and ID: \$125 billion and total employment of 1.5 million jobs.</p> <p>Total economic output in the 5-county GYA area: \$6.4 billion and 97,000 jobs.</p> <p>Gateway communities of Gardiner MT, West Yellowstone MT, Cody WY, Jackson WY: Status quo short term.</p> <p><u>Social Indices:</u> 67% of survey respondents agree that there should be motorized winter access to YNP.</p> <p>61% of respondents also are concerned about the disturbance to wildlife in the winter.</p> <p>Current winter visitors are those who are attracted by available opportunities, which at present are dominated by snowmobiling. Visitors who expect quiet nonmotorized experiences have been displaced from the parks, or their expectations are not met.</p> <p>The existing winter access policy is not preferred by the public in the region or the nation.</p> | <p><u>Economic Impacts:</u> 3 state region: maximum loss of 18.4 million (< -1%) and 471 jobs (< -1%)</p> <p>5-county GYA area: maximum loss of \$15.9 million (< -1%) and 499 jobs (< -1%).</p> <p>W. Yellowstone: economy would decline 6.5 - 8.5% short term</p> <p>No measurable economic impact on other gateway communities.</p> <p><u>Social Impacts:</u> Motorized oversnow access is provided in all areas. Mode of access is changed to snowcoach.</p> <p>A majority of local residents agree that snowmobiles adversely impact the parks and should be limited.</p> <p>Loss of opportunities to snowmobilers may shift participation rates to other winter activities, offsetting economic losses.</p> <p>A majority of regional and national respondents favor snowcoach access over snowmobile. This alternative would likely be favored in a regional or national forum.</p> | <p><u>Economic Impacts:</u> 3 state region: maximum loss of \$5.4 million (< -1%) and 127 jobs (< -1%).</p> <p>5-county GYA area: maximum loss of \$4.8 million (< -1%) and 106 jobs (< -1%)</p> <p>West Yellowstone: economy would decline by 2.3-2.5% short term</p> <p>No measurable economic impact on other gateway communities.</p> <p><u>Social Impacts:</u> Motorized oversnow access is provided in all areas. Mode of access is a mix of snowmobile and snowcoach.</p> <p>A majority of local residents agree that snowmobiles adversely impact the parks and should be limited.</p> <p>A minor decrease in opportunities to snowmobile from W. Yellowstone may shift participation to other gateways. Replacement behaviors not likely.</p> <p>A majority of regional and national respondents favor snowcoach access over snowmobile. This alternative would likely not be favored in a regional or national forum.</p> | <p><u>Economic Impacts:</u> 3 state region: maximum loss of \$14.5 million (< -1%) and 342 jobs (< -1%).</p> <p>5-county GYA area: maximum loss of \$12.9 million (<-1%) and 285 jobs (<-1%)</p> <p>West Yellowstone: winter economy would decline 5.6-5.9% short term</p> <p>No measurable economic impact on other gateway communities.</p> <p><u>Social Impacts:</u> Motorized oversnow access is provided in all areas. Mode of access is a mix of snowmobile and snowcoach.</p> <p>A majority of local residents agree that snowmobiles adversely impact the parks and should be limited.</p> <p>A minor decrease in opportunities to snowmobile from W. Yellowstone may shift participation to other gateways. Replacement behaviors not likely</p> <p>A majority of regional and national respondents favor snowcoach access over snowmobile. This alternative would likely not be favored in a regional or national forum.</p> | <p><u>Economic Impacts:</u> 3 state region: maximum loss of \$13.8 million (< -1%) and 324 jobs (< -1%).</p> <p>5-county GYA area: maximum loss of \$12.2 million (<-1%) and 271 jobs (<-1%)</p> <p>West Yellowstone: winter economy would decline 4.3-5.2% short term</p> <p>No measurable economic impact on other gateway communities.</p> <p><u>Social Impacts:</u> Motorized oversnow access is provided in all areas. Mode of access is a mix of snowmobile and snowcoach.</p> <p>A majority of local residents agree that snowmobiles adversely impact the parks and should be limited.</p> <p>A minor decrease in opportunities to snowmobile from W. Yellowstone may shift participation to other gateways. Replacement behaviors not likely</p> <p>A majority of regional and national respondents favor snowcoach access over snowmobile. This alternative would likely not be favored in a regional or national forum.</p> |
| Air Quality (NAAQS Parameters) | <p>For air quality, existing conditions were re-modeled in the SEIS:</p> <p><u>Parkwide Total Emissions (tons/yr):</u> CO=1,925, PM₁₀=10, HC=674, NO_x =16</p> <p><u>West Entrance:</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 12.20 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 30.20 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>West Entrance to Madison:</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 11.45 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 23.40 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>Flagg Ranch:</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 20.29 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 12.01 µgrams/m³</p> | <p><u>Parkwide Total Emissions (tons/yr):</u> After full implementation, CO=313, PM₁₀=1.1, HC=44, NO_x =11</p> <p><u>West Entrance (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 4.20 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 23.40 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>West Entrance to Madison (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 1.15 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 5.80 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>Flagg Ranch (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 5.96 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 5.06µgrams/m³</p> | <p><u>Parkwide Total Emissions (tons/yr):</u> After full implementation, CO=1,297, PM₁₀=10.4, HC=444, NO_x=13</p> <p><u>West Entrance (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 8.7 ppm. Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 45.40 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>West Entrance to Madison (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 6.15 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 27.00 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>Flagg Ranch (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 14.62 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 13.49 µgrams/m³</p> | <p><u>Parkwide Total Emissions (tons/yr):</u> After full implementation, CO=669, PM₁₀=1.2, HC=69, NO_x=66</p> <p><u>West Entrance (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 7.60 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 25.4 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>West Entrance to Madison (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 1.85 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 5.80 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>Flagg Ranch (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 15.75 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 8.17 µgrams/m³</p> | <p><u>Parkwide Total Emissions (tons per year):</u> After full implementation, CO=621, PM₁₀=1.1, HC=67, NO_x =62</p> <p><u>West Entrance (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 9.00 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 27.40 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>West Entrance to Madison (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 2.55 ppm Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ is 5.80 µgrams/m³</p> <p><u>Flagg Ranch (after full implementation):</u> Maximum 1-hour CO is 10.72 ppm. Maximum 24-hour PM₁₀ Ranch is 7.11 µgrams/m³</p> |

| | FEIS Alternative A (Existing Condition) | SEIS Alternatives 1a and 1b | SEIS Alternative 2 | SEIS Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 – The Preferred Alternative |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| Visibility | <p><u>Staging and Destination Areas:</u> Emissions cause local, perceptible visibility impacts near YNP West Entrance, in and around the Old Faithful area, and at Flagg Ranch.</p> <p><u>Oversnow Routes:</u> There is perceptible visibility impacts along heavily used roadway segments under certain viewing conditions.</p> | <p><u>Staging and Destination Areas:</u> Emissions would not cause any perceptible visibility impacts at staging areas.</p> <p><u>Oversnow Routes:</u> Emissions would not cause any perceptible visibility impacts along roadways.</p> | <p><u>Staging and Destination Areas:</u> Emissions cause local, perceptible visibility impacts near YNP West Entrance, in and around the Old Faithful area, and at Flagg Ranch.</p> <p><u>Oversnow Routes:</u> Emissions cause perceptible visibility impacts along the West Entrance to Madison Roadway.</p> | <p><u>Staging and Destination Areas:</u> Emissions cause local, perceptible visibility impacts in and around the Old Faithful area and at Flagg Ranch.</p> <p><u>Oversnow Routes:</u> Emissions would not cause perceptible visibility impacts along roadways.</p> | <p><u>Staging and Destination Areas:</u> Emissions cause local, perceptible visibility impacts in and around the Old Faithful area.</p> <p><u>Oversnow Routes:</u> Emissions would not cause perceptible visibility impacts along roadways.</p> |
| Health and Safety | <p><u>Safety:</u> Adverse, minor effects to visitor and employee safety from the West Entrance to Old Faithful and on the CDST. Adverse, negligible effects on less heavily traveled routes. Adverse, minor to moderate effects on visitors who use the East Entrance.</p> <p><u>Health:</u> Where high levels of NAAQS pollutants occur, employees and visitors who are susceptible to respiratory problems would likely be affected. High levels occur at staging areas where large numbers of oversnow vehicles are present in a relatively small area.</p> | <p><u>Safety:</u> Beneficial, major and long-term effects due to the elimination of snowmobiles.</p> <p><u>Health:</u> High levels of NAAQS pollutants are not likely to occur. Effects to public health due to high level of NAAQS pollutants would be virtually nonexistent.</p> | <p><u>Safety:</u> Same as current condition but effects may be mitigated by the prohibition on travel from 8:00 P.M. to 7:30 A.M., and reduced speed limits.</p> <p><u>Health:</u> Where high levels of NAAQS pollutants occur, employees and visitors who are susceptible to respiratory problems would likely be affected. High levels are likely to occur at staging areas (including West Entrance, Old Faithful, and Flagg Ranch) where large numbers of oversnow vehicles are present in a relatively small area. ATSDR MRLs could be approached or exceeded in staging areas.</p> | <p><u>Safety:</u> Negligible to minor adverse effects to visitor and employee safety from the West Entrance to Old Faithful and on the CDST. Adverse negligible effects on less heavily traveled routes. Effects may be mitigated by fewer numbers (relative to alternative 2), the prohibition on travel from 8:00 P.M. to 7:30 A.M. and mandatory use of guides.</p> <p><u>Health:</u> Where high levels of NAAQS pollutants occur, employees and visitors who are susceptible to respiratory problems would likely be affected, though to a lesser degree than in Alternative A or Alternative 2. ATSDR MRLs could be approached in staging areas.</p> | <p><u>Safety:</u> Same as alternative 3 but effects may be mitigated by the prohibition on travel from 8:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. and mandatory use of guides.</p> <p><u>Health:</u> Where high levels of NAAQS pollutants occur, employees and visitors who are susceptible to respiratory problems would likely be affected, though to a lesser degree than in Alternative A or Alternative 2. ATSDR MRLs could be approached in staging areas and occasionally exceeded.</p> |
| Wildlife-- Elk and Bison | <p>Effects of groomed surfaces on animal movements and population dynamics – unknown to what extent any beneficial effects outweigh negative effects.</p> <p>Displacement effects — adverse, moderate, and short-term.</p> <p>Risk of collisions with snowmobiles — negligible, adverse, and short-term.</p> | <p>Fewer groomed surfaces in GTNP and JDR, therefore related effects less than in FEIS alternative A. Same as A for YNP.</p> <p>Displacement effects less than FEIS alternative A due to mass transit; fewer vehicles using groomed surfaces.</p> <p>Risk of collision with snowmobiles less than FEIS alternative A due to prohibition on snowmobiles.</p> | <p>Groomed surfaces — same as FEIS alternative A.</p> <p>Displacement effects — same as FEIS alternative A.</p> <p>Risk of collisions with snowmobiles – same as FEIS alternative A; effects may be mitigated by slower speed limits and the prohibition of nighttime travel from 8 P.M. to 7:30 A.M.</p> | <p>Groomed surfaces — same as FEIS alternative A.</p> <p>Displacement effects — same as FEIS alternative A; effects are mitigated by requiring snowmobilers be accompanied by NPS permitted guides.</p> <p>Risk of collisions with snowmobiles – same as FEIS alternative A; effects may be mitigated by the prohibition of nighttime travel from 8 P.M. to 7:30 A.M.</p> | <p>Groomed surfaces — same as FEIS alternative A.</p> <p>Displacement effects — same as FEIS alternative A; effects are mitigated by requiring snowmobilers be accompanied by NPS permitted guides.</p> <p>Risk of collisions with snowmobiles – same as FEIS alternative A; effects may be mitigated by slower speed limits and the prohibition of nighttime travel from 8 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.</p> |
| Natural Soundscapes | Modeling assumptions have changed, therefore it would be inappropriate to compare the existing condition, as modeled in FEIS alternative A, with the SEIS alternatives. | <p><u>Audibility, all vehicles (quiet background conditions and poor atmospheric and snow conditions):</u> Audible at all on 114,432 ac. Audible more than 10% of the time on 31,173 ac. Audible more than 50% of the time on 12,327 ac.</p> <p><u>Audibility, oversnow vehicles only (quiet background conditions and poor atmospheric and snow conditions):</u> Audible at all on 89,296 ac. More than 10% of the time on 13,622 ac. More than 50% of the time on 0 ac.</p> | <p><u>Audibility, all vehicles (quiet background conditions and poor atmospheric and snow conditions):</u> Audible at all on 128,495 ac. Audible more than 10% of the time on 66,522 ac. Audible more than 50% of the time on 19,987 ac.</p> <p><u>Audibility, oversnow vehicles only (quiet background conditions and poor atmospheric and snow conditions):</u> Audible at all on 103,347 ac. More than 10% of the time on 49,052 ac. More than 50% of the time on 7,714 ac.</p> | <p><u>Audibility, all vehicles (quiet background conditions and poor atmospheric and snow conditions):</u> Audible at all on 155,488 ac. Audible more than 10% of the time on 98,680 ac. Audible more than 50% of the time on 29,246 ac.</p> <p><u>Audibility, oversnow vehicles only (quiet background conditions and poor atmospheric and snow conditions):</u> Audible at all on 130,293 ac. More than 10% of the time on 80,884 ac. More than 50% of the time on 16,845 ac.</p> | <p><u>Audibility, all vehicles (quiet background conditions and poor atmospheric and snow conditions):</u> Audible at all on 153,864 ac. Audible more than 10% of the time on 94,390 ac. Audible more than 50% of the time on 26,676 ac.</p> <p><u>Audibility, oversnow vehicles only (quiet background conditions and poor atmospheric and snow conditions):</u> Audible at all on 128,670 ac. More than 10% of the time on 76,658 ac. More than 50% of the time on 14,297 ac.</p> |

| | FEIS Alternative A (Existing Condition) | SEIS Alternatives 1a and 1b | SEIS Alternative 2 | SEIS Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 – The Preferred Alternative |
|--------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Visitor Access | Existing access and use defines the baseline condition for park visitation. Access is defined by travel corridors by which visitors arrive in the Greater Yellowstone Area, the gateways they use to enter the parks, the mode of transport used to enter and travel about the parks, and the levels of visitation that occur, on the average, by gateway. | These alternatives would provide access by oversnow motorized means through existing gateways at historical visitation levels. The mode of access would change from a mix of snowcoach and snowmobile to snowcoach only. | This alternative would provide access by oversnow motorized means through existing gateways. The mode of access would remain a mix of snowcoach and snowmobile. Historic use levels by snowmobile access at all gateways would be preserved. Capped use at West Yellowstone would allow current average use on a daily basis - current peak use would not be allowed. Other gateways would allow increased use by snowmobile. | This alternative would provide access by oversnow motorized means through existing gateways. The mode of access would remain a mix of snowcoach and snowmobile. Historic use levels by snowmobile access at gateways would be preserved except for that at West Yellowstone. Increased snowcoach access would be available at West Yellowstone to provide for historic visitation levels. | This alternative would provide access by oversnow motorized means through existing gateways. The mode of access would remain a mix of snowcoach and snowmobile. Historic use levels by snowmobile access at all gateways would be preserved. Capped use at West Yellowstone would allow current average use on a daily basis - current peak use would not be allowed. Other gateways would allow increased use by snowmobile. |
| Visitor Experience | <p><u>Effects on All Three Park Units:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little or no operational change would occur. Visitation would be influenced by the method of transportation available to visitors. For visitors who prefer to visit the parks via snowmobile, the visitor experience would continue to be highly satisfactory. Encounters with park wildlife and scenery would continue to be primary attractions, consequently the overall satisfaction of current winter visitors would remain high. Current levels of snowmobile emissions and sound levels would continue to detract from critical characteristics of the desired winter experience for many visitors resulting in direct short-term major adverse impacts on their visitor experience. The perceived unsafe behavior of others and the occurrence of visitor conflicts would continue to have direct short-term minor to moderate adverse effects on the experience of some users. Current motorized use would continue to deter some user groups from visiting or returning to the parks. | <p><u>Effects on Yellowstone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive management provisions for long-term protection of park resources may result in area closures, resulting in local direct adverse impacts on visitor experience. The reduction in emissions and sound under this alternative would result in direct major beneficial improvements to the experiences of park visitors. Opportunities to appreciate clean air would be greatly improved. Where oversnow motorized use occurs, via snowcoach, quiet and clean air would be facilitated by improved motorized technology. Less opportunities to view wildlife and scenery relative to the existing condition. Major beneficial changes relating to safety by eliminating the possibility of snowmobile related motor vehicle accidents. Elimination of snowmobiles would result in major adverse impacts to the experiences of visitors in this user group. | <p><u>Effects on All Three Park Units:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive management provisions for long-term protection of park resources may result in area closures, resulting in local direct adverse impacts on visitor experience. Opportunities to appreciate clean air would be increased from FEIS alternative A providing a minor to moderate beneficial effect. Where oversnow motorized use occurs and clean air would be facilitated by improved motorized technology. Due to the daily snowmobile entry limits, there would be an increase from current condition (FEIS alternative A) relative to opportunities for quiet and solitude. <p><u>Effects on Yellowstone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snowmobile users would experience little change in opportunities to view wildlife and scenery from FEIS alternative A. However, the quality of those experiences would be moderately and adversely affected for some visitors, particularly on peak use days. There would be few changes in the effects relating to safety from alternative A. | <p><u>Effects on All Three Park Units:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive management provisions: same effects as shown in other alternatives. Snowmobile users would experience little change in opportunities to view wildlife and scenery from alternative A as described in the FEIS. There would be moderate and beneficial improvements in Yellowstone to the quality of those experiences for some visitors. Opportunities to appreciate clean air, quiet and solitude would be increased from FEIS alternative A and decreased when compared to SEIS alternatives 1 and 2. Where oversnow motorized use occurs quiet and clean air would be facilitated by improved motorized technology and fewer vehicles. <p><u>Effects on Yellowstone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate improvements to safety because of the emphasis on guided tours and snowcoaches under this alternative. | <p><u>Effects on All Three Park Units:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive management provisions: same effects as shown in other alternatives. Snowmobile users would experience little change in opportunities to view wildlife and scenery from alternative A as described in the FEIS. There would be moderate and beneficial improvements in Yellowstone to the quality of those experiences for some visitors. Opportunities to appreciate clean air, quiet and solitude would be increased from FEIS alternative A and decreased when compared to SEIS alternatives 1 and 2. Where oversnow motorized use occurs quiet and clean air would be facilitated by improved motorized technology and fewer vehicles. <p><u>Effects on Yellowstone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate improvements to safety because of the emphasis on guided tours and snowcoaches under this alternative. |

| | FEIS Alternative A (Existing Condition) | SEIS Alternatives 1a and 1b | SEIS Alternative 2 | SEIS Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 – The Preferred Alternative |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Visitor Experience (continued) | | <p><u>Effects on Grand Teton/Parkway:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Negligible to minor adverse impacts on visitor experience relating to wildlife and scenery viewing due to the elimination of motorized travel on the frozen surface of Jackson Lake. ▪ Opportunities to view wildlife would be improved for nonmotorized users of these areas. ▪ Major beneficial changes relating to safety by eliminating snowmobile-related motor vehicle accidents, and wheeled-vehicle accidents from Colter Bay to Flagg Ranch. ▪ Major adverse impact for those who wish to ride snowmobiles. | <p><u>Effects on Grand Teton/Parkway:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Negligible to minor adverse impacts on visitor experience relating to wildlife and scenery viewing would occur because of the elimination of motorized travel on the frozen surface of Jackson Lake. Anglers however would not be affected. ▪ Moderate adverse effects to safety by continuing the possibility of snowmobile-related motor vehicle accidents and wheeled-vehicle accidents on the road segment from Moran Junction to Flagg Ranch. | <p><u>Effects on Yellowstone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The use limit of 330 snowmobiles entering from the West would result in moderate to major adverse effects on approximately 220 snowmobile enthusiasts (per day) who find entering from the West Entrance essential to their park experience. ▪ The use limit of 330 would result in moderate to major improvements to the groomed surface on that road segment. ▪ Moderate improvements to safety because of the emphasis on guided tours and snowcoaches under this alternative. <p><u>Effects on Grand Teton/Parkway:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Negligible to minor adverse impacts on visitor experience relating to wildlife and scenery viewing would occur because of the elimination of motorized travel on the frozen surface of Jackson Lake. <p>Moderate adverse effects relating to safety by continuing the possibility of snowmobile-related motor vehicle accidents, and wheeled-vehicle accidents on the road segment from Moran Junction to Flagg Ranch.</p> | <p><u>Effects on Grand Teton/Parkway:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Negligible to minor adverse impacts on visitor experience relating to wildlife and scenery viewing would occur because of the elimination of motorized travel on the frozen surface of Jackson Lake. ▪ Moderate adverse effects relating to safety by continuing the possibility of snowmobile-related motor vehicle accidents, and wheeled-vehicle accidents on the road segment from Moran Junction to Flagg Ranch. |